arXiv:math/9505203v1 [math.LO] 8 May 1995

HOW TO FORCE A COUNTABLY TIGHT, INITIALLY ω_1-COMPACT AND NON-COMPACT SPACE?

I. JUHÁSZ AND L. SOUKUP

February 1, 2008

ABSTRACT. Improving a result of M. Rabus we force a normal, locally compact, 0-dimensional, Frechet-Uryson, initially ω_1-compact and non-compact space X of size ω_2 having the following property: for every open (or closed) set A in X we have $|A| \leq \omega_1$ or $|X \setminus A| \leq \omega_1$.

1. Introduction

E. van Douwen and, independently, A. Dow [4] have observed that under CH an initially ω_1-compact T_3 space of countable tightness is compact. (A space X is initially κ-compact if any open cover of X of size $\leq \kappa$ has a finite subcover, or equivalently any subset of X of size $\leq \kappa$ has a complete accumulation point). Naturally, the question arose whether CH is needed here, i.e. whether the same is provable just in ZFC. The question became even more intriguing when in [2] D. Fremlin and P. Nyikos proved the same result from PFA. Quite recently, A. V. Arhangel'skiĭhas devoted the paper [1] to this problem, in which he has raised many related problems as well.

In [7] M. Rabus has answered the question of van Douwen and Dow in the negative. He constructed by forcing a Boolean algebra B such that the Stone space $St(B)$ includes a counterexample X of size ω_2 to the van Douwen–Dow question, in fact $St(B)$ is the one point compactification of X, hence X is also locally compact. The forcing used by Rabus is closely related to the one due to J. Baumgartner and S. Shelah in [3], which had been used to construct a thin very tall superatomic Boolean algebra. In particular, Rabus makes use of a so-called Δ-function f (which was also used and introduced in [3]) with some extra properties that are satisfied if f is obtained by the original, rather sophisticated forcing argument of Shelah from [3].

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54A25,03E35.

Key words and phrases. initially ω_1-compact, countable tightness, Frechet-Uryson, right separated space, forcing, Δ-function.

The preparation of this paper was supported by the Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research grant no. 16391.

In this paper we give an alternative forcing construction of counterexamples to the van Douwen–Dow question, which we think is simpler, more direct and more intuitive than the one in [7]. First of all, we directly force a topology τ_f on ω_2 that yields an example from a Δ-function (with no extra properties) in the ground model which also satisfies CH. There is a wide variety of such ground models since they are easily obtained when one forces a Δ-function or because $\square_{\omega_1}$ implies the existence of a Δ-function (cf. [3]).

Let us recall the definition of the Δ-functions from [3].

Definition 1.1. Let $f : \left[\omega_2\right]^2 \longrightarrow \left[\omega_2\right]^{\leq\omega}$ be a function with $f\{\alpha,\beta\} \subset \alpha \cap \beta$ for $\{\alpha,\beta\} \in \left[\omega_2\right]^2$. (1) We say that two finite subsets x and y of ω_2 are *good for* f provided that for $\alpha \in x \cap y$, $\beta \in x \setminus y$ and $\gamma \in y \setminus x$ we always have

(a) $\alpha < \beta, \gamma \Longrightarrow \alpha \in f\{\beta,\gamma\}$,
(b) $\alpha < \beta \Longrightarrow f\{\alpha,\gamma\} \subset f\{\beta,\gamma\}$,
(c) $\alpha < \gamma \Longrightarrow f\{\alpha,\beta\} \subset f\{\gamma,\beta\}$.

(2) We say that f is a Δ-*function* if every uncountable family of finite subsets of ω_2 contains two sets x and y which are good for f.

Both in [3] and [7] the main use of the Δ-function f is to suitably restrict the partial order of finite approximations to a structure on ω_2 so as to become c.c.c. This we do as well, but in the proof of the countable compactness of τ_f we also need the following simple result that yields an additional property of Δ-functions provided CH also holds. In fact, only property 1.1.(a) is needed for this.

Lemma 1.2. *Assume that CH holds, f is a Δ-function, $\{c_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_2\}$ are pairwise disjoint finite subsets of ω_2 and $B \in \left[\omega_2\right]^\omega$. Then for each $n \in \omega$ there are distinct ordinals $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1} \in \omega_2$ such that*

$$B \subset \bigcap\{f(\xi,\eta) : \xi \in c_{\alpha_i}, \eta \in c_{\alpha_j}, i < j < n\}.$$

Proof. We can assume that $\sup B < \min c_\alpha$ for each $\alpha < \omega_2$. Denote by S(n) the statement of the lemma for n. We prove S(n) by induction on n. The first non-trivial case is n=2. Assume indirectly that S(2) fails. Then for each $\alpha < \beta < \omega_2$ there is $b_{\alpha,\beta} \in B$ such that $b_{\alpha,\beta} \notin f(\xi,\eta)$ for some $\xi \in c_\alpha$ and $\eta \in c_\beta$. By CH the Erdős-Rado partition theorem [6] has the form $\omega_2 \longrightarrow (\omega_1)^2_\omega$, thus there are $I \in \left[\omega_2\right]^{\omega_1}$ and $b \in B$ such that for each $\alpha \neq \beta \in I$ we have $b \notin f(\xi,\eta)$ for some $\xi \in c_\alpha$ and $\eta \in c_\beta$.

Let $d_\alpha = c_\alpha \cup \{b\}$ for $\alpha \in I$. Since f is a Δ-function there are $\alpha \neq \beta \in I$ such that d_α and d_β are good for f. But $d_\alpha \cap d_\beta = \{b\}$ and $b < \min c_\alpha, \min c_\beta$, so by 1.1.(a) we have $b \in f(\xi,\eta)$ for each $\xi \in c_\alpha$ and $\eta \in c_\beta$ contradicting the choice of $b = b_{\alpha,\beta}$. Thus S(2) holds.

Assume now that S(n) holds for some $n \geq 2$ and we prove S(2n). Applying S(n) ω_2-many times for B and suitable final segments of $\{c_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_2\}$ we can obtain

ω_2-many pairwise disjoint n-element sets $\{\alpha^\nu_0, \alpha^\nu_1, \dots, \alpha^\nu_{n-1}\} \subset \omega_2$ such that for each $\nu < \omega_2$

$$B \subset \bigcap\{f(\xi,\eta) : \xi \in c_{\alpha^\nu_i}, \eta \in c_{\alpha^\nu_j}, i < j < n\}.$$

Let $d_\nu = \bigcup\{c_{\alpha^\nu_i} : i < n\}$ for $\nu < \omega_2$. Applying S(2) for B and the sequence $\{d_\nu : \nu < \omega_2\}$ we get ordinals $\nu < \mu < \omega_2$ such that $B \subset f(\xi,\eta)$ for all $\xi \in d_\nu$ and $\eta \in d_\mu$. In other words, if $i, j < n$, $\xi \in c_{\alpha^\nu_i}$ and $\eta \in c_{\alpha^\mu_j}$ then $B \subset f(\xi,\eta)$. Therefore the set $\{\alpha^\nu_0, \alpha^\nu_1, \dots, \alpha^\nu_{n-1}, \alpha^\mu_0, \alpha^\mu_1, \dots, \alpha^\mu_{n-1}\}$ witnesses S(2n). □

The following, even simpler, result about arbitrary functions $f : \left[\omega_2\right]^2 \longrightarrow \left[\omega_2\right]^{\leq\omega}$ with $f\{\alpha,\beta\} \subset \alpha \cap \beta$ for $\{\alpha,\beta\} \in \left[\omega_2\right]^2$ will also be needed.

Lemma 1.3. *If f is a function as above then for each $K, K' \in \left[\omega_2\right]^{\leq\omega}$ there is a countable set $\mathrm{cl}_f(K,K') \subset \omega_2$ such that*

(a) $K \subset \mathrm{cl}_f(K,K')$, $\sup K = \sup \mathrm{cl}_f(K,K')$,
(b) $\forall \xi \in \mathrm{cl}_f(K,K')\ \forall \eta \in \mathrm{cl}_f(K,K') \cup K'\ (f\{\xi,\eta\} \subset \mathrm{cl}_f(K,K'))$.

Proof. Let $\mathrm{K}(0) = K$, $\mathrm{K}(n+1) = \mathrm{K}(n) \cup \bigcup\{f\{\xi,\eta\} : \xi \in \mathrm{K}(n), \eta \in \mathrm{K}(n) \cup K'\}$ and $\mathrm{cl}_f(K,K') = \bigcup_{n<\omega} \mathrm{K}(n)$. □

The topology τ_f that we will construct on ω_2 is right separated (in the natural order of ω_2) and is also locally compact and 0-dimensional. Thus for each $\alpha \in \omega_2$ one can fix a compact (hence closed) and open neighbourhood $\mathrm{H}(\alpha)$ of α such that $\max \mathrm{H}(\alpha) = \alpha$. Conversely, if we can fix for each $\alpha \in \omega_2$ such a right-separating compact open neighbourhood $\mathrm{H}(\alpha)$ then the family $\{\mathrm{H}(\alpha) : \alpha < \omega_2\}$ determines the whole topology τ on ω_2. In fact, using the notation $\mathrm{U}(\alpha,b) = \mathrm{H}(\alpha) \setminus \bigcup\{\mathrm{H}(\beta) : \beta \in b\}$, it is easy to check that for each $\alpha \in \omega_2$ the family $\mathcal{B}_\alpha = \{\mathrm{U}(\alpha,b) : b \in \left[\alpha\right]^{<\omega}\}$ is a τ-neighbourhood base of α. Therefore, our notion of forcing consists of finite approximations to a family $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathrm{H}(\alpha) : \alpha < \omega_2\}$ like above.

Now, if $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathrm{H}(\alpha) : \alpha < \omega_2\}$ is as required and $\beta < \alpha < \omega_2$ then either (i) $\beta \in \mathrm{H}(\alpha)$ or (ii) $\beta \notin \mathrm{H}(\alpha)$. If (i) holds then $\mathrm{H}(\beta) \setminus \mathrm{H}(\alpha)$, if (ii) holds then $\mathrm{H}(\beta) \cap \mathrm{H}(\alpha)$ is a compact open subset of β, hence there is a finite subset of β, call it $i\{\alpha,\beta\}$, such that this set is covered by $\mathrm{H}[i\{\alpha,\beta\}] = \bigcup\{\mathrm{H}(\gamma) : \gamma \in i\{\alpha,\beta\}\}$ It may come as a surprise, but the existence of such a function i is also sufficient to insure that the collection $\mathcal{H}$ be as required. More precisely, we have the following result.

Definition 1.4. If $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathrm{H}(\alpha) : \alpha \in \omega_2\}$ is a family of subsets of ω_2 such that $\max \mathrm{H}(\alpha) = \alpha$ for each $\alpha \in \omega_2$ then we denote by $\tau_\mathcal{H}$ the topology on ω_2 generated by $\mathcal{H} \cup \{\omega_2 \setminus H : H \in \mathcal{H}\}$ as a subbase.

Clearly, $\tau_\mathcal{H}$ is a 0-dimensional, Hausdorff and right separated topology in which the elements of $\mathcal{H}$ are clopen.

Theorem 1.5. *Assume that $\mathcal{H}$ is as in definition* 1.4 *above and there is a function $i : \left[\omega_2\right]^2 \longrightarrow \left[\omega_2\right]^{<\omega}$ satisfying $i\{\alpha,\beta\} \subset \alpha \cap \beta$ for each $\{\alpha,\beta\} \in \left[\omega_2\right]^2$ such that if $\beta < \alpha$ then $\beta \in \mathrm{H}(\alpha)$ implies $\mathrm{H}(\beta) \setminus \mathrm{H}(\alpha) \subset \mathrm{H}[i\{\alpha,\beta\}]$ and $\beta \notin \mathrm{H}(\alpha)$ implies $\mathrm{H}(\beta) \cap \mathrm{H}(\alpha) \subset \mathrm{H}[i\{\alpha,\beta\}]$. Then each $\mathrm{H}(\alpha)$ is compact in the topology $\tau_{\mathcal{H}}$, hence $\tau_{\mathcal{H}}$ is locally compact.*

Proof. We do induction on $\alpha \in \omega_2$. Assume that for each $\beta \in \alpha$ we know $\mathrm{H}(\beta)$ is compact in $\tau_{\mathcal{H}}$. By Alexander's subbase lemma it suffices to show that any cover $\mathcal{K}$ of $\mathrm{H}(\alpha)$ by members of $\mathcal{H}$ and their complements has a finite subcover. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}$ be such that $\alpha \in K$. If $K = \mathrm{H}(\gamma)$ then $\alpha \leq \gamma$. The case $\alpha = \gamma$ is trivial so assume $\alpha < \gamma$. But then $\mathrm{H}(\alpha) \setminus K \subset \mathrm{H}[i\{\alpha,\gamma\}]$ and by our inductive hypothesis $\mathrm{H}(\beta)$ is compact for each $\beta \in i\{\alpha,\gamma\}$ hence so is $\mathrm{H}(\beta) \cap \mathrm{H}(\alpha) \setminus K$ being closed in $\mathrm{H}(\beta)$. Therefore $\mathrm{H}(\alpha) \setminus K$ is compact and so some finite $\mathcal{K}_0 \subset \mathcal{K}$ covers it. But then $\mathcal{K}_0 \cup \{K\}$ covers $\mathrm{H}(\alpha)$, hence we are done. A similar argument works if $K = \omega_2 \setminus \mathrm{H}(\gamma)$, then using $\mathrm{H}(\alpha) \cap \mathrm{H}(\gamma) \subset \mathrm{H}[i\{\alpha,\gamma\}]$ if $\alpha < \gamma$ (or the compactness of $\mathrm{H}(\gamma)$ if $\gamma < \alpha$). □

It is now very natural to try to force a generic 0-dimensional, locally compact and right separated topology on ω_2 by finite approximations (or pieces of information) of $\mathcal{H}$ and i. As was already mentioned, the Δ-function f comes into the picture when one wants to make this forcing c.c.c. The technical details of this are done in section 2.

We call the family $\mathcal{H}$ *coherent* if $\beta \in \mathrm{H}(\alpha)$ implies $\mathrm{H}(\beta) \subset \mathrm{H}(\alpha)$. Clearly, this makes things easier because then $\mathrm{H}(\beta) \setminus \mathrm{H}(\alpha) = \emptyset$, hence there is no problem covering it, the requirement on i is only that if $\beta \notin \mathrm{H}(\alpha)$ and $\beta < \alpha$ then $\mathrm{H}(\beta) \cap \mathrm{H}(\alpha) \subset \mathrm{H}[i\{\alpha,\beta\}]$. The original forcing of Baumgartner and Shelah from [3] (when translated to scattered, i.e. right separated, locally compact spaces rather than superatomic Boolean algebras) actually produced such a coherent family $\mathcal{H}$. This is interesting because if $\mathcal{H}$ is coherent and $\tau_{\mathcal{H}}$ is separable, which we have almost automatically if $\mathcal{H}$ is obtained generically, then $\tau_{\mathcal{H}}$ is also countably tight!

Theorem 1.6. *If there is a coherent family $\mathcal{H}$ of right separating compact open sets for a separable topology τ on ω_2 then $\mathrm{t}(\langle\omega_2,\tau\rangle) = \omega$.*

Proof. Let $X = \langle\omega_2,\tau\rangle$. Then for each $\alpha \in \omega_2$ we have $\mathrm{t}(\alpha, X) = \mathrm{t}(\alpha, \mathrm{H}(\alpha))$, hence it suffices to prove $\mathrm{t}(\alpha, \mathrm{H}(\alpha)) = \omega$. We do this by induction on α. So assume it for each $\beta < \alpha$. If we had $\mathrm{t}(\alpha, \mathrm{H}(\alpha)) = \omega_1$ then $\mathrm{H}(\alpha)$ would contain a free sequence $S = \{x_\nu : \nu < \omega_1\}$ of length ω_1. S must converge to α since for each $\beta < \alpha$ we have, by the inductive hypothesis, $\mathrm{t}(\mathrm{H}(\beta)) \leq \omega$, hence $|\mathrm{H}(\beta) \cap S| = \omega$. Let $F_\nu = \overline{\{x_\mu : \mu < \nu\}}$ for each $\nu < \omega_1$. Since S is free we have $\alpha \notin F_\nu$ for all $\nu < \omega_1$ and the sequence $\langle F_\nu : \nu < \omega_1\rangle$ is (strictly) increasing. For each $\nu < \omega_1$ there is a finite subset b_ν of F_ν such that $F_\nu \subset \mathrm{H}[b_\nu]$. Now, if $\mu < \nu$ then $b_\mu \subset F_\mu \subset F_\nu \subset \mathrm{H}[b_\nu]$ implies that for each $\beta \in b_\mu$ we have $\mathrm{H}(\beta) \subset \mathrm{H}[b_\nu]$ by the coherence of $\mathcal{H}$, hence $\mathrm{H}[b_\mu] \subset \mathrm{H}[b_\nu]$. But we have seen above that $|\mathrm{H}[b_\nu] \cap S| \leq \omega$ for each $\nu \in \omega_1$, while

of course $S \subset \bigcup\{\mathrm{H}[b_\nu] : \nu < \omega_1\}$, hence the $\mathrm{H}[b_\nu]$**'s** yield a strictly increasing ω_1-sequence of clopen sets in a separable space, which is a contradiction completing the proof. □

Ironically, this general result that gives countable tightness so easily cannot be used in our construction because we had to abandon the coherency of $\mathcal{H}$ in our effort to insure countable compactness (implied by the initial ω_1-compactness) of $\tau_{\mathcal{H}}$.

We mentioned above that our examples, by genericity, are separable. But this is not a coincidence. It is well-known and very easy to prove that if X is an initially ω_1-compact space then $\mathrm{t}(X) \leq \omega$ implies that X has no uncountable free sequence. (Moreover, if X is T_3 the converse of this is also true.) Hence the following easy, but perhaps not widely known, result immediately implies that any non-compact, initially ω_1-compact space of countable tightness contains a countable subset whose closure is not compact. Thus if there is a counterexample to the van Douwen–Dow question then there is also a separable one.

Lemma 1.7. *If Y is a non-compact topological space, then for some ordinal μ the space Y contains a free sequence $\{y_\xi : \xi < \mu\} \subset Y$ with non-compact closure.*

Proof. If Y is non-compact, then Y has an strictly increasing open cover $\{U_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ for some regular cardinal κ. We pick points $y_\xi \in X$ and ordinals $\alpha_\xi < \kappa$ by recursion as follows. If the closure of the set $Y_\xi = \{y_\eta : \eta < \xi\}$ in Y is compact, then pick $\alpha_\xi \in \kappa$ such that $\overline{Y_\xi} \subset U_{\alpha_\xi}$ and let $y_\xi \in Y \setminus U_{\alpha_\xi}$.

The sequence α_ξ is strictly increasing because $y_\eta \in U_{\alpha_\xi} \setminus U_{\alpha_\eta}$ for $\eta < \xi$. So for some $\xi \leq \kappa$ the closure of Y_ξ is non-compact. But Y_ξ is also free because for each $\eta < \xi$ we have $\overline{Y_\eta} \subset U_{\alpha_\eta}$ and $(Y_\xi \setminus Y_\eta) \cap U_{\alpha_\eta} = \emptyset$. So we are done. □

Note that under CH the weight of a separable T_3 space is $\leq \omega_1$, and an initially ω_1-compact space of weight $\leq \omega_1$ is compact, hence the CH result of van Douwen and Dow is a trivial consequence of 1.7. Arhangel'skiĭraised the question, [1, problem 3], whether in this CH can be weakened to $2^\omega < 2^{\omega_1}$? We shall answer this question in the negative: theorem 3.9 implies that the existence of a counterexample to the van Douwen–Dow question is consistent with practically any cardinal arithmetic that violates CH.

In [1, problem 17] Arhangel'skiĭasked if it is provable in ZFC that an initially ω_1-compact subspace of a T_3 space of countable tightness is always closed. (Clearly this is so under CH or PFA, or in general if the answer to the van Douwen–Dow question is "yes".) In view of our next result both Rabus' and our spaces give a negative answer to this question. More generally we have the following result.

Theorem 1.8. *If X is a locally compact counterexample to van Douwen–Dow then the one-point compactification $\alpha X = X \cup \{p\}$ of X also has countable tightness. On the other hand, X is an initially ω_1-compact non-closed subset of αX.*

Proof. Let $A \subset X$ be such that $p \in \overline{A}$ (i.e. $\overline{A}^X$ is not compact). By lemma 1.7 and our preceding remark then there is a countable set $S \subset \overline{A}^X$ such that $\overline{S}^X$ is not compact. But by $\mathrm{t}(X) = \omega$ then there is a countable $T \subset A$ for which $S \subset \overline{T}^X$, hence $\overline{T}^X$ is non-compact as well, so $p \in \overline{T}$. Consequently we have $\mathrm{t}(p, \alpha X) = \omega$ and so $\mathrm{t}(\alpha X) = \omega$. □

2. The forcing construction

The following notation will be used in the definition of the poset P_f. Given a function h and $a \subset \mathrm{dom}(h)$ we write $h[a] = \cup\{h(\xi) : \xi \in a\}$. Given non-empty sets x and y of ordinals with $\sup x \neq \sup y$ let

$$x * y = \begin{cases} x \cap y & \text{if } \sup x \notin y \text{ and } \sup y \notin x, \\ x \setminus y & \text{if } \sup x \in y, \\ y \setminus x & \text{if } \sup y \in x. \end{cases}$$

Definition 2.1. For each function $f : \left[\omega_2\right]^2 \longrightarrow \left[\omega_2\right]^{\leq\omega}$ satisfying $f(\alpha, \beta) \subset \alpha \cap \beta$ for any $\{\alpha, \beta\} \in \left[\omega_2\right]^2$ we define a poset $P_f = \langle P_f, \leq\rangle$ as follows. The underlying set of P_f is the family of triples $p = \langle a, h, i\rangle$ for which

(i) $a \in \left[\omega_2\right]^{<\omega}$, $h : a \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(a)$ and $i : \left[a\right]^2 \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(a)$ are functions,
(ii) $\max h(\xi) = \xi$ for each $\xi \in a$,
(iii) $i(\xi, \eta) \subset f(\xi, \eta)$ for each $\{\xi, \eta\} \in \left[a\right]^2$,
(iv) $h(\xi) * h(\eta) \subset h[i(\xi, \eta)]$ for each $\{\xi, \eta\} \in \left[a\right]^2$.

We will often write $p = \langle a^p, h^p, i^p\rangle$ for $p \in P_f$.
For $p, q \in P_f$ let $p \leq q$ if $a^p \supset a^q$, $h^p(\xi) \cap a^q = h^q(\xi)$ for $\xi \in a^q$, and $i^p \supset i^q$. If $p \in P_f$, $\alpha \in a^p$, $b \subset a^p \cap \alpha$, let us write $u^p(\alpha, b) = h^p(\alpha) \setminus h^p[b]$.

Lemma 2.2. *For each $\alpha < \omega_2$ the set $D_\alpha = \{p \in P_f : \alpha \in a^p\}$ is dense in P_f.*

Proof. Let $q \in P_f$ with $\alpha \notin a^q$. Define the condition $p \leq q$ by the stipulations $a^p = a^q \cup \{\alpha\}$, $h^p(\alpha) = \{\alpha\}$, $h^p(\xi) = h^q(\xi)$ and $i^p(\alpha, \xi) = \emptyset$ for $\xi \in a^q$. Then clearly $p \in D_\alpha$. □

Definition 2.3. If $\mathcal{G}$ is a P_f-generic filter over V, in $V[\mathcal{G}]$ we can define the topological space $X_f[\mathcal{G}] = X_f = \langle \omega_2, \tau_f\rangle$ as follows. For $\alpha \in \omega_2$ put $\mathrm{H}(\alpha) = \bigcup\{h^p(\alpha) : p \in \mathcal{G} \wedge \alpha \in a^p\}$, let $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathrm{H}(\alpha) : \alpha < \omega_2\}$ and let $\tau_f = \tau_{\mathcal{H}}$ as defined in 1.4, that is, τ_f is the topology on ω_2 generated by $\mathcal{H} \cup \{\omega_2 \setminus H : H \in \mathcal{H}\}$ as a subbase.

If $\mathcal{G}$ is a P_f-generic filter over V then by lemma 2.2 we have $\bigcup\{a^p : p \in \mathcal{G}\} = \omega_2$, and for each $\alpha < \omega_2$ $\max \mathrm{H}(\alpha) = \alpha$ and $\mathrm{H}(\alpha)$ is clopen in X_f. Thus X_f is 0-dimensional and right separated. Of course, neither f nor i is needed for this. As was explained in

section 1, we need f to be a Δ-function in order to make P_f c.c.c (which insures that no cardinal is collapsed), and the function i is used to make X_f also locally compact.

Theorem 2.4. *If CH holds and f is a Δ-function, then P_f satisfies the c.c.c and $V^{P_f} \models$ "$X_f = \langle \omega_2, \tau_f \rangle$ is a 0-dimensional, right separated, locally compact space having the following properties:*

(i) $t(X_f) = \omega$,
(ii) $\forall A \in [\omega_2]^{\omega_1}\ \exists \alpha \in \omega_2\ |A \cap H(\alpha)| = \omega_1$
(iii) $\forall A \in [\omega_2]^{\omega}$ ($\overline{A}$ *is compact or* $|\omega_2 \setminus \overline{A}| \leq \omega_1$)."

Consequently, in V^{P_f}, X_f is a locally compact, normal, countably tight, initially ω_1-compact but non-compact space.

Proof of theorem 2.4. To show that P_f satisfies c.c.c we will proceed in the following way. We first formulate when two conditions p and p' from P_f are called *good twins* (definition 2.5), then we construct the *amalgamation* $r = p + p'$ of p and p' (definition 2.6) and show that r is a common extension of p and p' in P_f. Finally we prove in lemma 2.8 that every uncountable family of conditions contains a couple of elements which are good twins.

Definition 2.5. Let $p = \langle a, h, i \rangle$ and $p' = \langle a', h', i' \rangle$ be from P_f. We say that p and p' are *good twins* provided

(1) p and p' are *twins*, i.e., $|a| = |a'|$ and the natural order-preserving bijection $e = e_{p,p'}$ between a and a' is an isomorphism between p and p':
  (i) $h'(e(\xi)) = e''h(\xi)$ for each $\xi \in a$,
  (ii) $i'(e(\xi), e(\eta)) = e''i(\xi, \eta)$ for each $\{\xi, \eta\} \in \left[a\right]^2$,
  (iii) $e(\xi) = \xi$ for each $\xi \in a \cap a'$,
(2) $i(\xi, \eta) = i'(\xi, \eta)$ for each $\{\xi, \eta\} \in \left[a \cap a'\right]^2$,
(3) a and a' are good for f.

Let us remark that, in view of (ii) and (iii), condition (2) can be replaced by "$i(\xi, \eta) \subset a \cap a'$ for each $\{\xi, \eta\} \in \left[a \cap a'\right]^2$".

Definition 2.6. If $p = \langle a, h, i \rangle$ and $p' = \langle a', h', i' \rangle$ are good twins we define the *amalgamation* $r = \langle b, g, j \rangle$ *of p and p'* as follows:

Let $b = a \cup a'$. For $\xi \in h[a \cap a'] \cup h'[a \cap a']$ define

$$\delta_\xi = \min\{\delta \in a \cap a' : \xi \in h(\delta) \cup h'(\delta)\}.$$

Now, for any $\xi \in b$ let

$$(\bullet) \qquad g(\xi) = \begin{cases} h(\xi) \cup h'(\xi) & \text{if } \xi \in a \cap a', \\ h(\xi) \cup \{\eta \in a' \setminus a : \delta_\eta \in h(\xi)\} & \text{if } \xi \in a \setminus a', \\ h'(\xi) \cup \{\eta \in a \setminus a' : \delta_\eta \in h'(\xi)\} & \text{if } \xi \in a' \setminus a. \end{cases}$$

Finally for $\{\xi,\eta\} \in \left[b\right]^2$ let

$$(\bullet\bullet) \qquad j(\xi,\eta) = \begin{cases} i(\xi,\eta) & \text{if } \xi,\eta \in a, \\ i'(\xi,\eta) & \text{if } \xi,\eta \in a', \\ f(\xi,\eta) \cap b & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(Observe that j is well-defined because 2.5.(2) holds.)
We will write $r = p + p'$ for the amalgamation of p and p'.

Lemma 2.7. *If p and p' are good twins then their amalgamation, $r = p + p'$, is a common extension of p and p' in P_f.*

Proof. First we prove two claims.

Claim 2.7.1. *Let $\eta \in a$ and $\delta \in a \cap a'$. Then $\eta \in h(\delta)$ if and only if δ_η is defined and $\delta_\eta \in h(\delta)$. (Clearly, we also have a symmetric version of this statement for $\eta \in a'$.)*

Proof of claim 2.7.1. Assume first $\eta \in h(\delta)$. Then δ_η is defined and clearly $\delta_\eta \in h(\delta)$ if $\delta_\eta = \delta$. So assume $\delta_\eta \neq \delta$. Since $i(\delta_\eta,\delta) \subset a \cap a'$ and $\max i(\delta_\eta,\delta) < \delta_\eta$ we have $\eta \notin h[i(\delta_\eta,\delta)]$ by the choice of δ_η. Thus from $p \in P_f$ we have

$$(\dagger) \qquad \eta \notin h(\delta_\eta) * h(\delta).$$

Then $h(\delta_\eta) * h(\delta) \neq h(\delta_\eta) \cap h(\delta)$ by $(\dagger)$. Since $\eta \in h(\delta)$ implies $\delta_\eta < \delta$, we actually have $h(\delta_\eta) * h(\delta) = h(\delta_\eta) \setminus h(\delta)$. Thus $\delta_\eta \in h(\delta)$ by the definition of the operation $*$.

On the other hand, if $\delta_\eta \in h(\delta)$, then either $\delta_\eta = \delta$ or $h(\delta_\eta) * h(\delta) = h(\delta_\eta) \setminus h(\delta)$. Thus $\eta \in h(\delta)$ because in the latter case again $\eta \notin h[i(\delta_\eta,\delta)]$, hence $(\dagger)$ holds. □

Claim 2.7.2. *If $\xi \in a \cap a'$ then*

$$g(\xi) = h(\xi) \cup \{\eta \in a' \setminus a : \delta_\eta \in h(\xi)\} = h'(\xi) \cup \{\eta \in a \setminus a' : \delta_\eta \in h'(\xi)\}.$$

Proof of claim 2.7.2. Conditions 2.5.1(i) and (iii) imply $h(\xi) \cap a \cap a' = h'(\xi) \cap a \cap a'$ and so

$$g(\xi) = h(\xi) \cup h'(\xi) = h(\xi) \cup ((a' \setminus a) \cap h'(\xi)).$$

By claim 2.7.1 we have

$$(a' \setminus a) \cap h'(\xi) = \{\eta \in a' \setminus a : \delta_\eta \in h'(\xi)\}.$$

But by 2.5.(1) we have $\delta_\eta \in h(\xi)$ iff $\delta_\eta \in h'(\xi)$, hence it follows that

$$g(\xi) = h(\xi) \cup \{\eta \in a' \setminus a : \delta_\eta \in h(\xi)\}.$$

The second equality follows analogously. □

Next we check $r \in P_f$. Conditions 2.1.(i)–(iii) for r are clear by the construction. So we should verify 2.1.(iv).

Let $\xi \neq \eta \in b$ and $\alpha \in g(\xi) * g(\eta)$. We need to show that $\alpha \in g[j(\xi,\eta)]$. We will distinguish several cases.

Case 1. $\xi, \eta \in a$ (*or* $\xi, \eta \in a'$).

Since $g(\xi) \cap a = h(\xi)$ and $g(\eta) \cap a = h(\eta)$ we have $(g(\xi) * g(\eta)) \cap a = h(\xi) * h(\eta)$ by the definition of operation $*$. Thus $(g(\xi) * g(\eta)) \cap a \subset h[i(\xi, \eta)] = g[j(\xi, \eta))] \cap a \subset g[j(\xi, \eta)]$. So we can assume that $\alpha \in a' \setminus a$. We know that δ_α is defined because $\alpha \in g(\xi) \cup g(\eta)$ is also satisfied. Since $\alpha \in g(\xi)$ iff $\delta_\alpha \in h(\xi)$ and $\alpha \in g(\eta)$ iff $\delta_\alpha \in h(\eta)$ by $(\bullet)$ it follows that $\delta_\alpha \in h(\xi) * h(\eta)$. Thus there is $\nu \in i(\xi, \eta)$ such that $\delta_\alpha \in h(\nu)$. But $i(\xi, \eta) = j(\xi, \eta)$ and $\alpha \in g(\nu)$ by $(\bullet)$. Thus $\alpha \in g[j(\xi, \eta)]$.

Case 2. $\xi \in a \setminus a'$ *and* $\eta \in a' \setminus a$.

We can assume that $\alpha \in a$, since the $\alpha \in a'$ case is done symmetrically.

Subcase 2.1. $g(\xi) * g(\eta) = g(\eta) \setminus g(\xi)$.

Then $\alpha \in g(\eta)$ and $\eta \in g(\xi)$ so δ_α and δ_η are both defined and $\delta_\alpha \in h'(\eta)$, $\delta_\eta \in h(\xi)$ hold, hence $\alpha \leq \delta_\alpha < \eta < \delta_\eta < \xi$. But a and a' are good for f, so by 1.1(a) we have $\delta_\alpha \in f(\eta, \xi) \cap b = j(\xi, \eta)$. Thus $\alpha \in h(\delta_\alpha) \subset g(\delta_\alpha) \subset g[j(\xi, \eta)]$ which was to be proved.

Subcase 2.2. $g(\xi) * g(\eta) = g(\xi) \cap g(\eta)$ *or* $g(\xi) * g(\eta) = g(\xi) \setminus g(\eta)$.

Since now $\alpha \in g(\xi) * g(\eta) \subset g(\xi)$, by the definition of the operation $*$ we have

$$|\{\alpha, \xi\} \cap g(\eta)| = 1. \tag{1}$$

Thus, by the definition of $g(\eta)$, $\delta^* = \min\{\delta \in a \cap a' : \alpha \in h(\delta) \vee \xi \in h(\delta)\}$ is well-defined and $\delta^* < \eta$. If $\delta^* < \xi$ then $\alpha \in h(\delta^*)$ and by 1.1(a) we have $\delta^* \in f(\xi, \eta) \cap b = j(\xi, \eta)$ for a and a' are good for f, and so $\alpha \in g[j(\xi, \eta)]$.

Thus we can assume $\xi < \delta^*$. We know that $\delta^* = \delta_\alpha$ or $\delta^* = \delta_\xi$ by the choice of δ^*, but $\delta_\alpha = \delta_\xi$ is impossible by (1). Thus

$$|\{\alpha, \xi\} \cap h(\delta^*)| = 1. \tag{2}$$

Since $\alpha \in g(\xi)$ implies $\alpha \in h(\xi)$ and we have $\xi < \delta^*$, (2) implies $\alpha \in h(\xi) * h(\delta^*)$ and so $\alpha \in h[i(\xi, \delta^*)]$. But $i(\xi, \delta^*) \subset f(\xi, \delta^*) \subset f(\xi, \eta)$ because a and a' are good for f, so 1.1(b) or (c) may be applied. Consequently, we have $i(\xi, \delta^*) \subset j(\xi, \eta)$ by $(\bullet\bullet)$. Hence $\alpha \in g[j(\xi, \eta)]$ which was to be proved.

Since we investigated all the cases it follows that r satisfies 2.1.(iv), that is, $r \in P_f$. Since $r \leq p, q$ are clear from the construction, the lemma is proved. □

Lemma 2.8. *Every uncountable family $\mathcal{F}$ of conditions in P_f contains a couple of elements which are good twins. Consequently, P_f satisfies c.c.c.*

Proof. By standard counting arguments $\mathcal{F}$ contains an uncountable subfamily $\mathcal{F}'$ such that every pair $p \neq p' \in \mathcal{F}'$ satisfies 2.5.(1)-(2). But f is a Δ-function, so there are $p \neq p' \in \mathcal{F}'$ such that a^p and $a^{p'}$ are good for f, i.e. p and p' satisfies 2.5.(3), too. In other words, p and p' are good twins and so $r = p + p'$ is a common extension of p and p' in P_f. □

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a P_f-generic filter over V. As in definition 2.3, let $\mathrm{H}(\alpha) = \bigcup\{h^p(\alpha) : p \in \mathcal{G} \wedge \alpha \in a^p\}$ for $\alpha \in \omega_2$, and let τ_f be the topology on ω_2 generated by $\{\mathrm{H}(\alpha) : \alpha \in \omega_2\} \cup \{\omega_2 \setminus \mathrm{H}(\alpha) : \alpha \in \omega_2\}$ as a subbase. Put $i = \bigcup\{i^p : p \in \mathcal{G}\}$.

Since X_f is generated by a clopen subbase and $\max(H(\alpha)) = \alpha$ for each $\alpha \in \omega_2$ by 2.1(ii), it follows that X_f is 0-dimensional and right separated in its natural well-order.

The following proposition is clear by 2.1.(iv) and by the definition of H and i.

Proposition. $\mathrm{H}(\alpha) * \mathrm{H}(\beta) \subset \mathrm{H}[i(\alpha, \beta)]$ *for* $\alpha < \beta < \omega_2$. *So by* 1.5 *every* $\mathrm{H}(\alpha)$ *is a compact open set in* X_f.

Definition 2.9. For $\alpha \in \omega_2$ and $b \in \left[\alpha\right]^{<\omega}$ let

$$\mathrm{U}(\alpha, b) = \mathrm{H}(\alpha) \setminus \mathrm{H}[b]$$

and let

$$\mathcal{B}_\alpha = \{\mathrm{U}(\alpha, b) : b \in \left[\alpha\right]^{<\omega}\}.$$

By theorem 1.5 every $\mathrm{H}(\alpha)$ is compact and $\mathcal{B}_\alpha$ is a neighborhood base of α in X_f. Thus X_f is locally compact and the neighbourhood base $\mathcal{B}_\alpha$ of α consists of compact open sets.

Unfortunately, the family $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathrm{H}(\alpha) : \alpha < \omega_2\}$ is not coherent, so we can't apply theorem 1.6 to prove that X_f is countably tight. It will however follow from the following result.

Lemma 2.10. *In* V^{P_f}, *if a sequence* $\{z_\zeta : \zeta < \omega_1\} \subset \mathrm{H}(\beta)$ *converges to* β, *then there is some* $\xi < \omega_1$ *such that* $\beta \in \overline{\{z_\zeta : \zeta < \xi\}}$.

Proof. Assume on the contrary that for each $\xi < \omega_1$ we can find a finite subset $b_\xi \subset \beta$ such that $\{z_\zeta : \zeta < \xi\} \cap \mathrm{U}(\beta, b_\xi) = \emptyset$, that is, $\{z_\zeta : \zeta < \xi\} \subset \mathrm{H}[b_\xi]$.

Fix now a condition $p \in P_f$ which forces the above described situation and decides the value of β. Then, for each $\xi < \omega_1$ we can choose a condition $p_\xi \leq p$ which decides the value of z_ξ and b_ξ. We can assume that $\{a^{p_\xi} : \xi < \omega_1\}$ forms a Δ-system with kernel D, $z_\xi \in a^{p_\xi} \setminus D$ and that $z_\xi < z_\eta$ for $\xi < \eta < \omega_1$.

Claim. *Assume that* $\xi < \eta < \omega_1$, p_ξ *and* p_η *are good twins and* $r = p_\xi + p_\eta$. *Then* $r \Vdash$ "$z_\xi \in \mathrm{H}[D \cap \beta]$".

Proof of the claim. Indeed, $z_\xi \in h^r[b_\eta]$ because $r \leq p_\xi, p_\eta$. Since $z_\xi \in a^{p_\xi} \setminus a^{p_\eta}$, $(\bullet)$ and claim 2.7.2 imply that $z_\xi \in h^r[b_\eta]$ holds if and only if $\delta_{z_\xi} \in D = a^{p_\xi} \cap a^{p_\eta}$ is defined and $\delta_{z_\xi} \in h^{p_\eta}[b_\eta]$. Since $b_\eta \subset \beta$, we also have $\delta_{z_\xi} < \beta$ and so $z_\xi \in h^r[D \cap \beta]$. □

Applying lemma 2.8 to appropriate final segments of $\{p_\xi : \xi < \omega_1\}$ we can choose, by induction on $\mu < \omega_1$, pairwise different ordinals $\mu < \xi_\mu < \eta_\mu < \omega_1$ with $\eta_\mu < \xi_\nu$ if $\mu < \nu$ such that p_{ξ_μ} and p_{η_μ} are good twins. Let $r_\mu = p_{\xi_\mu} + p_{\eta_\mu}$. Since P_f satisfies c.c.c there is a condition $q \leq p$ such that $q \Vdash$" $|\{\mu \in \omega_1 : r_\mu \in \mathcal{G}\}| = \omega_1$". Thus, by the claim $q \Vdash$"$|\{z_\xi : \xi < \omega_1\} \cap \mathrm{H}[D \cap \beta]| = \omega_1$", i.e. the neighbourhood $\mathrm{U}(\beta, D \cap \beta)$ of β misses uncountably many of the points z_ξ which contradicts that β is the limit of this sequence. □

Corollary 2.11. $\mathrm{t}(X_f) = \omega$.

Proof. Assume on the contrary that $\alpha \in \omega_2$ and $\mathrm{t}(\alpha, X_f) = \mathrm{t}(\alpha, \mathrm{H}(\alpha)) = \omega_1$. Then there is an ω-closed set $Y \subset \mathrm{H}(\alpha)$ that is not closed. Since the subspace $H(\alpha)$ is compact and right separated and so it is pseudo-radial , for some regular cardinal κ there is a sequence $\{z_\xi : \xi < \kappa\} \subset Y$ which converges to some point $\beta \in H(\alpha) \setminus Y$. Since Y is ω-closed and $|Y| \leq |\,\mathrm{H}(\alpha)| = \omega_1$ we have $\kappa = \omega_1$. By lemma 2.10 there is some $\xi < \omega_1$ with $\beta \in \overline{\{z_\zeta : \zeta < \xi\}} \subset Y$ contradicting $\beta \notin Y$. □

Lemma 2.12. *In V^{P_f}, for each uncountable $A \subset X_f$ there is $\beta \in \omega_2$ such that $|A \cap \mathrm{H}(\beta)| = \omega_1$.*

Proof. Assume that $p \Vdash$ "$\dot{A} = \{\dot{\alpha}_\xi : \xi < \omega_1\} \in \left[\omega_2\right]^{\omega_1}$". For each $\xi < \omega_1$ pick $p_\xi \leq p$ and $\alpha_\xi \in \omega_2$ such that $p_\xi \Vdash \dot{\alpha}_\xi = \hat{\alpha}_\xi$. Since P_f satisfies c.c.c we can assume that the α_ξ are pairwise different. Let $\sup\{\alpha_\xi : \xi < \omega_1\} < \beta < \omega_2$. Now for each $\xi < \omega_1$ define the condition $q_\xi \leq p_\xi$ by the stipulations $a^{q_\xi} = a^{p_\xi} \cup \{\beta\}$, $h^{q_\xi}(\beta) = a^{q_\xi}$ and $i^{q_\xi}(\nu, \beta) = \emptyset$ for $\nu \in a^{p_\xi}$. Then $q_\xi \in P_f$ and $q_\xi \Vdash \dot{\alpha}_\xi \in \mathrm{H}(\beta)$. But P_f satisfies c.c.c, so there is $q \leq p$ such that $q \Vdash$ "$|\{\xi \in \omega_1 : q_\xi \in \mathcal{G}\}| = \omega_1$". Thus $q \Vdash$ "$|A \cap \mathrm{H}(\beta)| = \omega_1$." □

Since every $\mathrm{H}(\beta)$ is compact, lemma 2.12 above clearly implies that X_f is ω_1-compact, i.e. every subset $S \subset X_f$ of size ω_1 has a complete accumulation point.

Now we start to work on (iii): in V^{P_f} the closure of any countable subset Y of X_f is either compact or it contains a final segment of ω_2. If Y is also in the ground model, then actually the second alternative occurs and this follows easily from the next lemma.

Lemma 2.13. *If $p \in P_f$, $\beta \in a^p$, $b \subset a^p \cap \beta$, $\alpha \in \beta \setminus a^p$, then there is a condition $q \leq p$ such that $\alpha \in u^q(\beta, b)$.*

Proof. Define the condition $q \leq p$ by the following stipulations: $a^q = a^p \cup \{\alpha\}$, $h^q(\alpha) = \{\alpha\}$,

$$h^q(\nu) = \begin{cases} h^p(\nu) \cup \{\alpha\} & \text{if } \beta \in h^p(\nu) \\ h^p(\nu) & \text{if } \beta \notin h^p(\nu) \end{cases}$$

for $\nu \in a^p$, and let $i^q \supset i^p$ and $i^q(\alpha,\nu) = \emptyset$ for $\nu \in a^p$.

To show $q \in P_f$ we need to check only 2.1(iv). Assume that $\alpha \in h^q(\nu) * h^q(\mu)$. Then by the construction of q we have $\beta \in h^p(\nu) * h^p(\mu)$. Thus there is $\xi \in i^p(\nu,\mu)$ with $\beta \in h^p(\xi)$. But then $\alpha \in h^q(\xi)$, so by $i^q(\nu,\mu) = i^p(\nu,\mu)$ we have $\alpha \in h^q[i^q(\nu,\mu)]$. In view of $h^p(\nu) * h^p(\mu) \subset h^p[i^p(\nu,\mu)]$ we are done. Thus $q \in P_f$, $q \leq p$ and clearly $\alpha \in u^q(\beta,b)$, so we are done. □

This lemma yields the following corollary.

Corollary 2.14. *If $Z \in \left[\omega_2\right]^\omega \cap V$ and $\beta \in \omega_2 \setminus \sup Z$ then $\beta \in \overline{Z}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathrm{U}(\beta,b)$ be a neighbourhood of β, $b \in \left[\beta\right]^{<\omega}$. Since $p \Vdash$"$\mathrm{U}(\beta,b) \supset u^p(\beta,b)$" for each $p \in P_f$ and the set

$$D_{\beta,b,Z} = \{q \in P_f : u^q(\beta,b) \cap Z \neq \emptyset\}$$

is dense in P_f by the previous lemma, it follows that $\mathrm{U}(\beta,b)$ intersects Z. Consequently $\beta \in \overline{Z}$. □

The space X_f is right separated, i.e. scattered, so we can consider its Cantor-Bendixon hierarchy. According to corollary 2.14 for each $\alpha < \omega_2$ the set $A_\alpha = [\omega\alpha, \omega\alpha + \omega)$ is a dense set of isolated points in $X_f \restriction (\omega_2 \setminus \omega\alpha)$. Thus the α^{th} Cantor-Bendixon level of X_f is just A_α. Therefore X_f is a thin very tall, locally compact scattered space in the sense of [8]. Let us emphasize that CH was not needed to get this result, hence we have also given an alternative proof of the main result of [3].

Now we continue to work on proving property 2.4(iii) of X_f.

Given $p \in P_f$ and $b \subset a^p$ let $p \restriction b = \left\langle b, h, i^p \restriction \left[b\right]^2 \right\rangle$ where h is the function with $\mathrm{dom}(h) = b$ and $h(\xi) = h^p(\xi) \cap b$ for $\xi \in b$. Let us remark that $p \restriction b$ in not necessarily in P_f. In fact, $p \restriction b \in P_f$ if and only if $i^p(\xi,\eta) \subset b$ for each $\xi \neq \eta \in b$. Especially, if b is an initial segment of a^p, then $p \restriction b \in P_f$. The order $\leq$ of P_f can be extended in a natural way to the restrictions of conditions: if p and q are in P_f, $b \subset a^p$, $c \subset a^q$, define $p \restriction b \leq q \restriction c$ iff $b \supset c$, $h^p(\xi) \cap c = h^q(\xi) \cap c$ for each $\xi \in c$, and $i^p \restriction \left[c\right]^2 = i^q \restriction \left[c\right]^2$. Clearly if $p \restriction b \in P_f$ and $q \restriction c \in P_f$ then the two definitions of $\leq$ coincide.

Definition 2.15. Let $p, p' \in P_f$ with $a^p = a^{p'}$. We write $p \prec p'$ if for each $\alpha \in a^p$ and $b \subset a^p \cap \alpha$ we have $u^p(\alpha,b) \subset u^{p'}(\alpha,b)$.

The following technical result will play a crucial role in the proof of 2.4(iii). Part (c) in it will enable us to "insert" certain things in $\mathrm{H}(\gamma_0)$ in a non-trivial way. But there is a price we have to pay for this: this is the point where the coherency of the $\mathrm{H}(\alpha)$ has to be abandoned. Part (d) will be needed in section 3.

Lemma 2.16. *Assume that $s = \langle a^s, h^s, i^s\rangle \in P_f$, $a^s = S \cup E \cup F$, $Q \subset S$, $S <_{On} E <_{On} F$, $E = \{\gamma_i : i < k\}$, $\gamma_0 < \gamma_1 < \cdots < \gamma_{k-1}$, $F = \{\gamma_{i,0}, \gamma_{i,1} : i < k\}$, moreover*

(i) $\forall i < k\ h^s(\gamma_{i,0}) \cap h^s(\gamma_{i,1}) = h^s[Q \cup E]$,
(ii) $\forall i < k\ \forall \xi \in S\ f(\xi, \gamma_i) = f(\xi, \gamma_{i,0}) = f(\xi, \gamma_{i,1})$.

Then there is a condition $r = \langle a^r, h^r, i^r \rangle$ with $a^r = S \cup E$ such that

(a) $r \leq s\lceil S$,
(b) $r \leq s\lceil (Q \cup E)$,
(c) $S \setminus h^s[Q \cup E] \subset h^r(\gamma_0)$,
(d) $s\lceil (S \cup E) \prec r$.

Proof. Let $a^r = S \cup E$ and write $C = S \setminus h^s[Q \cup E]$. For $\xi \in a^r$ we set

$$h^r(\xi) = \begin{cases} h^s(\xi) \cup C & \text{if } \xi = \gamma_i \text{ and } \gamma_0 \in h^s(\gamma_i), \\ h^s(\xi) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For $\xi \neq \eta \in a^r$ we let

$$i^r(\xi, \eta) = \begin{cases} i^s(\xi, \eta) & \text{if } \xi, \eta \in Q \cup E \text{ or } \xi, \eta \in S, \\ f(\xi, \eta) \cap a^r & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Finally let $r = \langle a^r, h^r, i^r \rangle$.

We claim that r satisfies the requirements of the lemma. (a), (b) and (c) are clear from the definition of r, once we establish that $r \in P_f$. To see that it suffices to check only 2.1.(iv) because the other requirements are clear from the construction of r. So let $\xi < \eta \in a^r$. We have to show $h^r(\xi) * h^r(\eta) \subset h^r[i^r(\xi, \gamma_i)]$.

If $\xi, \eta \in S$, then $h^r(\xi) * h^r(\eta) \subset h^r[i^r(\xi, \eta)]$ holds because $r\lceil S = s\lceil S \in P_f$.

So we can assume that $\eta = \gamma_i$ for some $i < k$.

Case 1. $\xi \in S$.

Subcase 1.1. *$\xi \notin h^r(\gamma_i)$, hence $h^r(\xi) * h^r(\gamma_i) = h^r(\xi) \cap h^r(\gamma_i)$.*

In this case we also have $h^s(\xi) * h^s(\gamma_i) = h^s(\xi) \cap h^s(\gamma_i$ and so

$$h^s(\xi) \cap h^s(\gamma_i) \subset h^s[i^s(\xi, \gamma_i)] \subset h^r[i^r(\xi, \gamma_i)] \tag{3}$$

for $i^r(\xi, \gamma_i) \supset i^s(\xi, \gamma_i,)$. If $\gamma_0 \notin h^s(\gamma_i)$ then $h^r(\gamma_i) = h^s(\gamma_i)$ and since $h^r(\xi) = h^s(\xi)$ we have $h^r(\xi) * h^r(\gamma_i) = h^s(\xi) \cap h^s(\gamma_i) \subset h^r[i^r(\xi, \gamma_i)]$ by (3). Assume now that $\gamma_0 \in h^s(\gamma_i)$. Thus $h^r(\gamma_i) = h^s(\gamma_i) \cup C$, and so $\xi \notin C$, that is $\xi \in h^s[Q \cup E]$. Then $h^r(\xi) * h^r(\gamma_i) = h^r(\xi) \cap h^r(\gamma_i) = (h^s(\xi) \cap h^s(\gamma_i)) \cup (h^s(\xi) \cap C)$. By (3) above it is enough to show that $h^s(\xi) \cap C \subset h^r[i^r(\xi, \gamma_i)]$. Since $h^s(\xi) \cap C = \emptyset$ for $\xi \in Q$ we can assume that $\xi \notin Q$. By (i) $h^s[Q \cup E] = h^s(\gamma_{i,0}) \cap h^s(\gamma_{i,1})$ and so

$$h^s(\xi) \cap C = h^s(\xi) \setminus h^s[Q \cup E] = (h^s(\xi) \setminus h^s(\gamma_{i,0})) \cup (h^s(\xi) \setminus h^s(\gamma_{i,1})). \tag{4}$$

Since $\xi \in h^s[Q \cup E] \subset h^s(\gamma_{i,j})$ for $j = 0, 1$ we have

$$h^s(\xi) \setminus h^s(\gamma_{i,j}) = h^s(\xi) * h^s(\gamma_{i,j}) \subset h^s[i^s(\xi, \gamma_{i,j})]. \tag{5}$$

By (ii), $i^s(\xi,\gamma_{i,j}) \subset f(\xi,\gamma_{i,j}) \cap a^s = f(\xi,\gamma_i) \cap a^s$. Since $\xi \notin Q$ it follows that $f(\xi,\gamma_i) \cap a^s = i^r(\xi,\gamma_i)$. Thus from (5) we obtain

$$h^s(\xi) \setminus h^s(\gamma_{i,j}) \subset h^s[i^r(\xi,\gamma_i)] = h^r[i^r(\xi,\gamma_i)]. \tag{6}$$

Putting (4) and (6) together we get $h^s(\xi) \cap C \subset h^r[i^r(\xi,\gamma_i)]$ which was to be proved.

Subcase 1.2. *$\xi \in h^r(\gamma_i)$, hence $h^r(\xi) * h^r(\gamma_i) = h^r(\xi) \setminus h^r(\gamma_i)$.*

If $\xi \in h^s(\gamma_i)$ then since $h^s(\xi) = h^r(\xi)$ we have $h^r(\xi) * h^r(\gamma_i) = h^r(\xi) \setminus h^r(\gamma_i) \subset h^s(\xi) \setminus h^s(\gamma_i) \subset h^s[i^s(\xi,\gamma_i)] \subset h^r[i^r(\xi,\gamma_i)]$ and we are done.

So we can assume that $\xi \notin h^s(\gamma_i)$ and so $h^r(\gamma_i) \neq h^s(\gamma_i)$. By the construction of r, we have $\gamma_0 \in h^s(\gamma_i)$, $h^r(\gamma_i) = h^s(\gamma_i) \cup C$ and so $\xi \in C$, i.e $\xi \notin h^s[Q \cup E]$. By (i) we can assume that $\xi \notin h^s(\gamma_{i,0})$. So $s \in P_f$ implies

$$h^s(\xi) \cap h^s(\gamma_{i,0}) = h^s(\xi) * h^s(\gamma_{i,0}) \subset h^s[i^s(\xi,\gamma_{i,0})] \tag{7}$$

We have

$$h^r(\xi) * h^r(\gamma_i) = h^s(\xi) \setminus (h^s(\gamma_i) \cup C) \subset h^s(\xi) \setminus C \tag{8}$$

and applying (i) again

$$h^s(\xi) \setminus C = h^s(\xi) \cap h^s[Q \cup E] \subset h^s(\xi) \cap h^s(\gamma_{i,0}). \tag{9}$$

By (ii), $i^s(\xi,\gamma_{i,0}) \subset f(\xi,\gamma_{i,0}) \cap a^s = f(\xi,\gamma_i) \cap a^s$. Since $\xi \notin Q \subset h^s[Q \cup E]$ it follows that $f(\xi,\gamma_i) \cap a^s = i^r(\xi,\gamma_i)$ and so (7)–(9) together yield

$$h^r(\xi) * h^r(\gamma_i) \subset h^r[i^r(\xi,\gamma_i)] \tag{10}$$

which was to be proved.

Case 2. *$\xi = \gamma_j$ for some $j < i$.*

Since $i^s(\gamma_j,\gamma_i) = i^r(\gamma_j,\gamma_i)$ we have

$$h^s(\gamma_j) * h^s(\gamma_i) \subset h^r[i^r(\gamma_i,\gamma_j)]. \tag{11}$$

It is easy to check that

$$h^r(\gamma_j) * h^r(\gamma_i) = \begin{cases} h^s(\gamma_j) * h^s(\gamma_i) & \text{if } \gamma_0 \notin h^s(\gamma_j) * h^s(\gamma_i), \\ h^s(\gamma_j) * h^s(\gamma_i) \cup C & \text{if } \gamma_0 \in h^s(\gamma_j) * h^s(\gamma_i). \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

So we are done if $\gamma_0 \notin h^s(\gamma_j) * h^s(\gamma_i)$. Assume $\gamma_0 \in h^s(\gamma_j) * h^s(\gamma_i)$. Then there is $\gamma_l \in i^s(\gamma_j,\gamma_i)$ with $\gamma_0 \in h^s(\gamma_l)$. Thus, by the construction of r we have

$$C \subset h^r(\gamma_l) \subset h^r[i^r(\gamma_j,\gamma_i)] \tag{13}$$

But (12) and (13) together imply what we wanted.

Thus we proved $r \in P_f$.

Clearly r satisfies 2.16.(a)–(c). To check 2.16.(d) write $s' = s^\frown(S \cup E)$ and let $\alpha \in S \cup E$ and $b \subset (S \cup E) \cap \alpha$. We need to show that $u^{s'}(\alpha,b) \subset u^r(\alpha,b)$. Since

$S \cup E$ is an initial segment of a^s, we have $u^{s'}(\alpha, b) = u^s(\alpha, b)$. If $\alpha \in S$, then also $u^{s'}(\alpha, b) = u^r(\alpha, b)$, so we can assume $\alpha \in E$.

Let $\xi \in u^{s'}(\alpha, b) = u^s(\alpha, b)$. Then $\xi \in h^s(\alpha) \subset h^s[E]$, and hence $\xi \notin C$. But $h^r[b] \setminus h^s[b] \subset C$, more precisely, it is empty or just C. Since $\xi \in u^s(\alpha, b)$, it follows that $\xi \notin h^s[b]$ and so $\xi \notin h^r[b]$ because $\xi \notin C$. Thus $\xi \in u^r(\alpha, b)$. Hence r satisfies (d).

The lemma is proved. □

Lemma 2.17. *In V^{P_f}, if $Y \subset \omega_2$ is countable, then either $\overline{Y}$ is compact or $|\omega_2 \setminus \overline{Y}| \leq \omega_1$.*

Proof. Assume that $1_{P_f} \Vdash$"$\dot{Y} = \{\dot{y}_n : n \in \omega\} \subset \omega_2$". For each $n \in \omega$ fix a maximal antichain $C_n \subset P_f$ such that for each $p \in C_n$ there is $\alpha \in a^p$ with $p \Vdash$"$\dot{y}_n = \hat{\alpha}$". Let $A = \bigcup\{a^p : p \in \bigcup_{n<\omega} C_n\}$. Since every C_n is countable by c.c.c we have $|A| = \omega$.

Assume also that $1_{P_f} \Vdash$ "$\overline{\dot{Y}}$ is not compact", that is, Y can not be covered by finitely many $H(\delta)$ in V^{P_f}.

Let

$$I = \{\delta < \omega_2 : \exists p \in P_f \ p \Vdash \text{"}\delta \notin \overline{\dot{Y}}\text{"}\}.$$

Clearly $1_{P_f} \Vdash \omega_2 \setminus I \subset \overline{\dot{Y}}$. Since $\omega_2 \setminus I$ is in the ground model, by corollary 2.14 it is enough to show that $\omega_2 \setminus I$ is infinite. Actually we will prove much more:

Claim. *I is not stationary in ω_2.*

Assume on the contrary that I is stationary. Let us fix, for each $\delta \in I$, a condition $p_\delta \in P_f$ and a finite set $D_\delta \in \left[\delta\right]^{<\omega}$ such that $p_\delta \Vdash$ "$\dot{Y} \cap \mathrm{U}(\delta, D_\delta) = \emptyset$". For each $\delta \in I$ let $Q_\delta = a^{p_\delta} \cap \delta$ and $E_\delta = a^{p_\delta} \setminus \delta$. We can assume that $D_\delta \subset Q_\delta$ and $\sup A < \delta$ for each $\delta \in I$.

Let $B_\delta = \mathrm{cl}_f(A \cup Q_\delta, E_\delta)$ for $\delta \in I$ (see 1.3). For each $\delta \in I$ the set B_δ is countable with $\sup(B_\delta) = \sup(A \cup Q_\delta)$, so we can apply Fodor's pressing down lemma and CH to get a stationary set $J \subset I$ and a countable set $B \subset \omega_2$ such that $B_\delta = B$ for each $\delta \in J$.

By thinning out J and with a further use of CH we can assume that for a fixed $k \in \omega$ we have

(1) $E^\delta = \{\gamma_i^\delta : i < k\}$ for $\delta \in J$, $\gamma_0^\delta < \gamma_1^\delta < \cdots < \gamma_{k-1}^\delta$,
(2) $f(\xi, \gamma_i^\delta) = f(\xi, \gamma_i^{\delta'})$ for each $\xi \in B$, $\delta, \delta' \in J$ and $i < k$.

Let $\delta = \min J$, $D = D_\delta$, $E = E_\delta$, $p = p_\delta$, $Q = Q_\delta$. By lemma 1.2 there are ordinals $\delta_j \in J$ with $\delta < \delta_0 < \delta_1 < \cdots < \delta_{2k-1}$ such that

$$(\star) \qquad B \cup E \subset \bigcap\{f(\xi, \eta) : \xi \in E_{\delta_i}, \eta \in E_{\delta_j}, i < j < 2k\}.$$

For $i < k$ and $j < 2$ let $\gamma_i = \gamma_i^\delta$ and $\gamma_{i,j} = \gamma_i^{\delta_{2i+j}}$. Let $F = \{\gamma_{i,j} : i < k, j < 2\}$.

We know that $a^p = Q \cup E$. Define the condition $q \in P_f$ by the following stipulations:

(i) $a^q = a^p \cup F$ and $q \leq p$,
(ii) $h^q(\gamma_{i,j}) = \{\gamma_{i,j}\} \cup a^p$ for $\langle i,j\rangle \in k \times 2$
(iii) $i^q(\gamma_{i_0,j_0}, \gamma_{i_1,j_1}) = a^p$ for $\langle i_0,j_0\rangle \neq \langle i_1,j_1\rangle \in k \times 2$,
(iv) $i^q(\xi, \gamma_{i,j}) = \emptyset$ for $\xi \in a^p$ and $\langle i,j\rangle \in k \times 2$.

Since $a^p \subset B \cup E$, $(\star)$ implies that $q \in P_f$.

Since $1_{P_f} \Vdash$ "$\mathrm{H}[Q \cup E] \not\supset \dot{Y}$", there is a condition $t \leq q$, a natural number n and an ordinal α such that $t \Vdash$ "$\alpha = \dot{y}_n$" but $\alpha \in a^t \setminus h^t[Q \cup E]$. Since C_n is a maximal antichain we can assume that $t \leq v$ for some $v \in C_n$.

Let $s = t\lceil(B \cup E \cup F)$. Then $s \in P_f$ because for each pair $\xi < \eta \in a^s$ if $\xi \in B$ then $i^t(\xi,\eta) \subset f(\xi,\eta) \subset B$ and so $i^t(\xi,\eta) \subset a^s$, and if $\xi, \eta \in E \cup F$ then $i^t(\xi,\eta) = i^q(\xi,\eta) \subset Q \cup E \subset a^s$. Moreover $s \leq v$ because $a^v \subset B$. Thus $s \Vdash$ "$\alpha = \dot{y}_n$" and $\alpha \notin h^s[Q \cup E]$. Let $S = a^s \cap B$.

Since $i^s(\gamma_{i,0}, \gamma_{i,1}) = i^q(\gamma_{i,0}, \gamma_{i,1}) = Q \cup E$, and $\gamma_{i,j} \notin h^s(\gamma_{i,1-j})$ we have

$$h^s(\gamma_{i,0}) \cap h^s(\gamma_{i,1}) = h^s(\gamma_{i,0}) * h^s(\gamma_{i,1}) \subset h^s[Q \cup E]. \tag{14}$$

Moreover, if $\xi \in Q \cup E$ and $j < 2$ then $\xi \in h^q(\gamma_{i,j}) \subset h^s(\gamma_{i,j})$ and $i^s(\xi, \gamma_{i,j}) = \emptyset$, consequently

$$h^s(\xi) \setminus h^s(\gamma_{i,j}) = h^s(\xi) * h^s(\gamma_{i,j}) \subset h^s[i^s(\xi, \gamma_{i,j})] = \emptyset. \tag{15}$$

Putting (14) and (15) together it follows that $h^s(\gamma_{i,0}) \cap h^s(\gamma_{i,1}) = h^s[Q \cup E]$.

Thus we can apply 2.16 to get a condition r such that $r \leq s\lceil(Q \cup E) = p$, $r \leq s\lceil S \leq v$ and $\alpha \in S \setminus h^s[Q \cup E] \subset h^s(\gamma_0) = h^s(\delta)$. Since $D \subset Q$, we have $\alpha \in h^s(\delta) \setminus h^s[D]$.

Thus

$$r \Vdash \alpha \in \dot{Y} \cap (H(\delta) \setminus \mathrm{H}[D]).$$

On the other hand $r \Vdash \dot{Y} \cap (H(\delta) \setminus \mathrm{H}[D]) = \emptyset$ because $r \leq p$. With this contradiction the claim is proved and this completes the proof of the lemma. □

Clearly, lemma 2.17 implies that X_f is countably compact.

Corollary 2.18. *If $F \subset X$ is closed (or open), then either $|F| \leq \omega_1$ or $|X \setminus F| \leq \omega_1$.*

Proof. If $|F| = \omega_2$ then F is not compact, so by lemma 1.7 F contains a free sequence Y with non-compact closure. But F is initially ω_1-compact and countably tight, so Y is countable. Consequently, we have $|\omega_2 \setminus \overline{Y}| \leq \omega_1$ by lemma 2.17 and so $|X \setminus F| \leq \omega_1$. □

Corollary 2.19. *X_f is normal and $\mathrm{z}(X_f) = \mathrm{hd}(X_f) \leq \omega_1$.*

Proof. To show that X_f is normal let F_0 and F_1 be disjoint closed subsets of X_f. Since at least one of them is compact by lemma 2.17 they can be separated by open subsets of X_f because X_f is T_3.

Concerning the hereditarily density of X_f it follows easily from corollary 2.18 that X_f does not contain a discrete subspace of size ω_2. But X_f is right separated, so all the left separated subspaces of X_f are of size $\leq \omega_1$, that is , $\mathrm{z}(X) \leq \omega_1$. □

Thus theorem 2.4 is proved. □

We know that the space X_f is not automatically hereditarily separable, so the following question of Arhangel'skiĭ, [1, problem 5], remains unanswered: Is it true in ZFC that every hereditarily separable, initially ω_1-compact space is compact?

As we have seen our space X_f is normal. However, we don't know whether X_f is or can be made hereditarily normal, i.e. T_5. This raises the following problem.

Problem 1. *Is it provable in ZFC that every T_5, countably tight, initially ω_1-compact space is compact?*

3. Making X_f Frechet-Uryson

In [1, problem 12] Arhangel'skiĭasks if it is provable in ZFC that a normal, first countable initially ω_1-compact space is necessarily compact. We could not completely answer this question, but in this section we show that the Frechet-Uryson property (which is sort of half-way between countable tightness and first countability) in not enough to get compactness.

To achieve that we want to find a further extension of the model V^{P_f} in which X_f becomes Frechet-Uryson but its other properties are preserved, for example, X_f remains initially ω_1-compact and normal. Since X_f is countably tight and $\chi(X_f) \leq \omega_1$ it is a natural idea to make X_f Frechet-Uryson by constructing a generic extension of V^{P_f} in which X_f remains countably tight and $p > \omega_1$, i.e. $MA_{\omega_1}(\sigma\text{-centered})$ holds (see [9, theorem 8]).

The standard c.c.c poset P which forces $p > \omega_1$ is obtained by a suitable finite support iteration of length 2^{ω_1}. During this iteration in the α^{th} step we choose a non-principal filter $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ generated by at most ω_1 elements and we add a new subset A of ω to the α^{th} intermediate model so that A is almost contained in every element of $\mathcal{F}$, i.e. $A \setminus F$ is finite for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$. It is well-known and easy to see that P has property K. Thus, by theorem 3.1 below, X_f remains countably tight in $V^{P_f * R}$ and so indeed X_f becomes Frechet-Uryson in that model. Moreover, theorem 3.2 implies that the ω_1-compactness of X_f is also preserved. Unfortunately, we could not prove that forcing with P preserves the countable compactness of X_f.

So, instead of aiming at $p > \omega_1$ we will consider only those filters during the iteration which are needed in proving the Frechet-Uryson property of X_f. As we will see, we can handle these filters in such a way that our iterated forcing R preserves not only the countable compactness of X_f but also property (iii) from theorem 2.4: in $V^{P_f * R}$ the closure of any countable subset of X_f is either compact or contains a

final segment of ω_2. Of course, this will insure the preservation of the normality of X_f as well.

We start with the two easy theorems, promised above, about the preservation of countable tightness and ω_1-compactness of X_f under certain c.c.c forcings.

Theorem 3.1. *If the topological space X is right separated, compact, countably tight and the poset R has property K then forcing with R preserves the countable tightness of X.*

Proof. First we recall that X remains compact (and clearly right separated) in any extension of the ground model by [5, lemma 7]. Since $\mathrm{F}(X) = \mathrm{t}(X)$ for compact spaces, assume indirectly that $1_R\Vdash$ "$\{\dot{z}_\xi : \xi < \omega_1\} \subset X$ *is a free sequence*". For every $\xi < \omega_1$ we have that $1_R\Vdash$"$\overline{\{\dot{z}_\zeta : \zeta < \xi\}}$ *and* $\overline{\{\dot{z}_\zeta : \xi \leq \zeta < \omega_1\}}$ *are disjoint compact sets*" and X is T_3, so we can fix a condition $p_\xi \in P$, open sets U_ξ and V_ξ from the ground model and a point $z_\xi \in X$ such that $\overline{U_\xi} \cap \overline{V_\xi} = \emptyset$ and

$$p_\xi\Vdash\text{“ } \{\dot{z}_\zeta : \zeta < \xi\} \subset U_\xi,\ \{\dot{z}_\zeta : \xi \leq \zeta < \omega_1\} \subset V_\xi \text{ and } \dot{z}_\xi = z_\xi\text{.”}$$

Since R has property K, there is an uncountable set $I \subset \omega_1$ such that the conditions $\{p_\xi : \xi \in I\}$ are pairwise compatible.

We claim that the sequence $\{z_\xi : \xi \in I\}$ is an uncountable free sequence in the ground model which contradicts $\mathrm{F}(X) = \mathrm{t}(X) = \omega$. Indeed let $\xi \in I$. If $\zeta \in I \cap \xi$, then p_ξ and p_ζ has a common extension q in P and we have

$$q\Vdash\text{“}\dot{z}_\zeta = z_\zeta \text{ and } \{\dot{z}_\eta : \eta < \xi\} \subset \dot{U}_\xi\text{.”}$$

Hence $z_\zeta \in U_\xi$. Similarly for $\zeta \in I \setminus \xi$ we have $z_\zeta \in V_\xi$. Therefore $\overline{U_\xi}$ and $\overline{V_\xi}$ separate $\overline{\{z_\zeta : \zeta \in I \cap \xi\}}$ and $\overline{\{z_\zeta : \zeta \in I \setminus \xi\}}$ which implies that $\{z_\xi : \xi \in I\}$ is really free. □

Theorem 3.2. *Forcing with a c.c.c poset R over V^{P_f} preserves property 2.4.(ii) of the space X_f, i.e. for each uncountable $A \subset X_f$ there is $\beta \in \omega_2$ such that $A \cap H(\beta)$ is uncountable.*

Proof. We work in V^{P_f}. Assume that $r\Vdash_R$ "$\dot{A} = \{\dot{\alpha}_\xi : \xi < \omega_1\} \in \left[X_f\right]^{\omega_1}$". For each $\xi < \omega_1$ pick a condition $r_\xi \leq r$ from R which decides the value of $\dot{\alpha}_\xi$, $r_\xi\Vdash_R$ "$\dot{\alpha}_\xi = \alpha_\xi$". Since R satisfies c.c.c, $\{\alpha_\xi : \xi \in \omega_1\}$ is uncountable, hence as X_f has property (ii) in V^{P_f}, for some $\beta < \omega_2$ the set $I = \mathrm{H}(\beta) \cap \{\alpha_\xi : \xi < \omega_1\}$ is also uncountable. Since R satisfies c.c.c there is a condition $q \leq r$ in R such that $q\Vdash_R$ "$|\{\xi \in I : r_\xi \in \mathcal{G}\}| = \omega_1$", where $\mathcal{G}$ is the R-generic filter over V^{P_f}. Thus $q\Vdash_R$ "$|\dot{A} \cap \mathrm{H}(\beta)| = \omega_1$" which was to be proved. □

Of course, theorem 3.2 implies that forcing with any c.c.c poset R preserves the ω_1-compactness of X_f. It is much harder to find a property of a poset R which guarantees that forcing with R over V^{P_f} preserves the countable compactness of X_f. We will proceed in the following way. In definition 3.3 we formulate when a poset

$\dot{R}$ is called *nice (over P_f)*, and then in theorem 3.4 we show that forcing with a nice poset preserves not only the countable compactness of X_f, but also property 2.4(iii): the closure of any countable subset of X_f is either compact or contains a final segment of ω_2. Finally, in definitions 3.5 and 3.6 we describe a class of finite support iterated forcings, which by theorem 3.7 are nice and have property K , and then in theorem 3.9 we show that forcing with a suitable member of this class makes X_f Frechet-Uryson.

Definition 3.3. Let $\dot{R}$ be a name for a poset in V^{P_f}. We say that $\dot{R}$ is *nice (over P_f)* if there is a dense subset $\mathcal{D}$ of the iteration $P_f * \dot{R}$ with the following property: If $\langle p_0, r_0\rangle, \langle p_1, r_1\rangle \in \mathcal{D}$, $p, p' \in P_f$ are such that $p \leq p_0, p_1$, $p' \leq p_0, p_1$, and

$$p \Vdash \text{“}r_0 \text{ and } r_1 \text{ are compatible in } \dot{R}\text{”},$$

moreover we have either $p \leq p'$ or $p \prec p'$ (see definition 2.15) then we also have

$$p' \Vdash \text{“}r_0 \text{ and } r_1 \text{ are compatible in } \dot{R}\text{”}.$$

Theorem 3.4. *If CH holds in V, f is a Δ-function and $\dot{R}$ is a P_f-name for a c.c.c poset which is nice over P_f, then 2.4.(iii) is preserved by forcing with $\dot{R}$, i.e.*

$$V^{P_f * \dot{R}} \models \forall Y \in \Big[X_f\Big]^{\omega} (\ \overline{Y} \textit{ is compact or } |X_f \setminus \overline{Y}| \leq \omega_1\ ).$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{D} \subset P_f * \dot{R}$ witness that $\dot{R}$ is nice.

Assume that $1_{P * \dot{R}} \Vdash$“$\dot{Y} = \{\dot{y}_n : n \in \omega\} \subset \omega_2$”. For each $n \in \omega$ fix a maximal antichain $C_n \subset \mathcal{D}$ such that for each $\langle p, r\rangle \in C_n$ there is $\alpha \in a^p$ with $\langle p, r\rangle \Vdash$“$\dot{y}_n = \hat{\alpha}$”. Let $A = \bigcup\{a^p : \langle p, r\rangle \in \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} C_n\}$. Since every C_n is countable by c.c.c we have $|A| = \omega$.

Assume that $1_{P_f * \dot{R}} \Vdash$ “$\overline{\dot{Y}}$ is not compact”, that is, $\dot{Y}$ can not be covered by finitely many $H(\delta)$ in $V^{P_f * \dot{R}}$.

Let

$$I = \{\gamma < \omega_2 : \exists\, \langle p, r\rangle \in P_f * \dot{R}\ \ \langle p, r\rangle \Vdash \text{“}\gamma \notin \overline{\dot{Y}}\text{”}\}.$$

Since $\omega_2 \setminus I$ is in the ground model and $1_{P_f * \dot{R}} \Vdash \omega_2 \setminus I \subset \overline{\dot{Y}}$, it is enough to show that $\omega_2 \setminus I$ is infinite. Indeed, in this case $\overline{\omega_2 \setminus I}$ contains a final segment of ω_2 by corollary 2.14. (Note that the closure of a ground model set does not change under any further forcing.) Thus the next claim completes the proof of this theorem.

Claim. *I is not stationary.*

Assume on the contrary that I is stationary. For each $\delta \in I$ fix a condition $\langle p_\delta, r_\delta\rangle \in P_f * \dot{R}$ and a finite set $D_\delta \in \Big[\delta\Big]^{<\omega}$ such that $\langle p_\delta, r_\delta\rangle \Vdash$ “$Y \cap \mathrm{U}(\delta, D_\delta) = \emptyset$”. For each $\delta \in I$ write $Q_\delta = a^{p_\delta} \cap \delta$ and $E_\delta = a^{p_\delta} \setminus \delta$. We can assume that $D_\delta \subset Q_\delta$, $\delta \in E_\delta$ and $\sup A < \delta$ for each $\delta \in I$.

Let $B_\delta = \mathrm{cl}_f(A \cup Q_\delta, E_\delta)$ for $\delta \in I$ (see 1.3). Since B_δ is a countable set with $\sup(B_\delta) = \sup(A \cup Q_\delta)$ and so $\sup(B_\delta) < \delta$, we can apply Fodor's pressing down lemma and CH to get a stationary set $J \subset I$ and a countable set $B \subset \omega_2$ such that $B_\delta = B$ for each $\delta \in J$.

By thinning out J and with a another use of CH we can assume that for some fixed $k \in \omega$ we have

(1) $E^\delta = \{\gamma^\delta_i : i < k\}$ for $\delta \in J$, $\gamma^\delta_0 < \gamma^\delta_1 < \cdots < \gamma^\delta_{k-1}$,
(2) $f(\xi, \gamma^\delta_i) = f(\xi, \gamma^{\delta'}_i)$ for each $\xi \in B$, $\delta, \delta' \in J$ and $i < k$.

Let $\delta = \min J$, $D = D_\delta$, $E = E_\delta$, $p = p_\delta$, $r = r_\delta$, $Q = Q_\delta$. By lemma 1.2 there are $2k$ ordinals $\delta_j \in J$ with $\delta < \delta_0 < \delta_1 < \cdots < \delta_{2k-1}$ from J such that

$$(\star) \qquad B \cup E \subset \bigcap\{f(\xi, \eta) : \xi \in E_{\delta_i}, \eta \in E_{\delta_j}, i < j < 2k\}.$$

For $i < k$ and $j < 2$ let $\gamma_i = \gamma^\delta_i$ and $\gamma_{i,j} = \gamma_i^{\delta_{2i+j}}$. Let $F = \{\gamma_{i,j} : i < k, j < 2\}$.

We know that $a^p = Q \cup E$. Define the condition $q \in P_f$ by the following stipulations:

(i) $a^q = a^p \cup F$ and $q \le p$,
(ii) $h^q(\gamma_{i,j}) = \{\gamma_{i,j}\} \cup a^p$ for $\langle i, j\rangle \in k \times 2$
(iii) $i^q(\gamma_{i_0,j_0}, \gamma_{i_1,j_1}) = a^p$ for $\langle i_0, j_0\rangle \neq \langle i_1, j_1\rangle \in k \times 2$,
(iv) $i^q(\xi, \gamma_{i,j}) = \emptyset$ for $\xi \in a^p$ and $\langle i, j\rangle \in k \times 2$.

Since $a^p \subset B \cup E$, $(\star)$ implies that $q \in P_f$ and so $\langle q, r\rangle \in P * \dot R$.

Since $1_{P_f * \dot R} \Vdash$ "H$[Q \cup E]$ *does not cover* Y", there is a condition $\langle t, u\rangle \le \langle q, r\rangle$ in $P_f * \dot R$, a natural number n and an ordinal α such that $\langle t, u\rangle \Vdash$ "$\alpha = \dot y_n$" but $\alpha \in a^t \setminus h^t[Q \cup E]$. Since C_n is a maximal antichain we can assume that $\langle t, u\rangle \le \langle c, d\rangle$ for some $\langle c, d\rangle \in C_n$.

Let $s = t^\frown(B \cup E \cup F)$, $w = t^\frown(S \cup E)$ and $S = a^s \cap B = a^w \cap B$. Then s and w are in P_f because for each pair $\xi < \eta \in a^s$ if $\xi \in B$ then $i^t(\xi, \eta) \subset f(\xi, \eta) \subset B$ and so $i^t(\xi, \eta) \subset S$, and if $\xi, \eta \in E \cup F$ then $i^t(\xi, \eta) = i^q(\xi, \eta) \subset Q \cup E \subset a^s \cap a^w$. Moreover $s \le w \le p, c$ because $a^c \subset a^t \cap B = S$ and $a^p = Q \cup E \subset a^t \cap \subset B \cup E$.

Since $\langle t, u\rangle \le \langle p, r\rangle$ and $\langle t, u\rangle \le \langle c, d\rangle$, so

$$(*) \qquad t \Vdash \text{" } r \text{ and } d \text{ are compatible in } \dot R\text{"}.$$

Since $t \le w \le p, c$ and $\dot R$ is nice for P_f we have

$$(**) \qquad w \Vdash \text{" } r \text{ and } d \text{ are compatible in } \dot R\text{"}.$$

We know $s \le c$ and so $s \Vdash$"$\alpha = \dot y_n$" and $\alpha \in a^s \setminus h^s[Q \cup E]$.

Since $i^s(\gamma_{i,0}, \gamma_{i,1}) = i^q(\gamma_{i,0}, \gamma_{i,1}) = Q \cup E$, and $\gamma_{i,j} \notin h^s(\gamma_{i,1-j})$ we have

$$(16) \qquad h^s(\gamma_{i,0}) \cap h^s(\gamma_{i,1}) = h^s(\gamma_{i,0}) * h^s(\gamma_{i,1}) \subset h^s[Q \cup E].$$

If $\xi \in Q \cup E$, then $\xi \in h^q(\gamma_{i,j}) \subset h^s(\gamma_{i,j})$ and $i^s(\xi, \gamma_{i,j}) = \emptyset$ and so

$$(17) \qquad h^s(\xi) \setminus h^s(\gamma_{i,j}) = h^s(\xi) * h^s(\gamma_{i,j}) \subset h^s[i^s(\xi, \gamma_{i,j})] = \emptyset.$$

Putting (16) and (17) together it follows that $h^s(\gamma_{i,0}) \cap h^s(\gamma_{i,1}) = h^s[Q \cup E]$. Thus we can apply 2.16 to get a condition $p^* \in P_f$ such that $p^* \leq s\lceil(Q \cup E) = p$, $p^* \leq s\lceil S \leq c$, $w \prec p^*$ and $\alpha \in S \setminus h^s[Q \cup E] \subset h^{p^*}(\gamma_0) = h^{p^*}(\delta)$. But $D \subset Q$, so $\alpha \in h^{p^*}(\delta) \setminus h^{p^*}[D]$. Hence $p^* \Vdash$ "$\alpha \in \mathrm{U}(\delta, D)$".

Since $p^* \leq p, c$ and $w \prec p^*$ and $\dot{R}$ is nice, it follows from (**) that

(***) $$p^* \Vdash \text{“ } r \text{ and } d \text{ are compatible in } \dot{R}\text{”}.$$

Thus $\langle p, r\rangle$ and $\langle c, d\rangle$ have a common extension $\langle p^*, r^*\rangle$ in $P * \dot{R}$.

But then

$$\langle p^*, r^*\rangle \Vdash \dot{y}_n = \alpha \in \dot{Y} \cap \mathrm{U}(\delta, D)$$

because $\langle p^*, r^*\rangle \leq \langle c, d\rangle$. On the other hand $\langle p^*, r^*\rangle \Vdash$ "$\dot{Y} \cap \mathrm{U}(\delta, D) = \emptyset$" because $\langle p^*, r^*\rangle \leq \langle p, r\rangle$. Contradiction, the claim is proved, which completes the proof of the theorem. □

Definition 3.5. Assume that $A \in \left[X_f\right]^\omega$ and $\alpha \in \overline{A}$. We define the poset $Q(A, \alpha)$ as follows. Its underlying set is $\left[A\right]^{<\omega} \times \left[\alpha\right]^{<\omega}$. If $\langle s, C\rangle$ and $\langle s'C'\rangle$ are conditions, let $\langle s, C\rangle \leq \langle s'C'\rangle$ if and only if $s \supset s'$, $C \supset C'$ and $s \setminus s' \subset \mathrm{U}(\alpha, C')$. For $q \in Q(A, \alpha)$ write $q = \langle s^q, C^q\rangle$ and $\mathrm{supp}(q) = s^q \cup C^q$.

It is well-known and easy to see that if $\mathcal{G}$ is a $Q(A, \alpha)$-generic filter, then $S = \bigcup\{s^q : q \in \mathcal{G}\}$ is a sequence from A which converges to α, i.e. every open neighbourhood of α contains all but finitely many points of S.

Clearly $Q(A, \alpha)$ is σ-centered and well-met. In fact, if $p_0 = \langle s_0, C_0\rangle$ and $p_1 = \langle s_1, C_1\rangle$ are compatible, then $p_0 \wedge p_1 = \langle s_0 \cup s_1, C_0 \cup C_1\rangle$.

Definition 3.6. A finite support iterated forcing $\langle R_\xi : \xi \leq \kappa\rangle$ over V^{P_f} is called an *FU-iteration* if for each $\xi < \kappa$ we have

$$1_{P_f * R_\xi} \Vdash R_{\xi+1} = R_\xi * Q(\dot{A}, \dot{\alpha}) \text{ for some } \dot{A} \in \left[X_f\right]^\omega \text{ and } \dot{\alpha} \in \overline{\dot{A}}.$$

Since every $Q(A, \alpha)$ is σ-centered, it is clear that any FU-iteration is c.c.c, in fact it even has property K. The really important, and much less trivial, property of them is given in our next result.

Theorem 3.7. *Any FU-iteration is nice over P_f.*

Proof. Assume that $\langle R_\xi : \xi \leq \kappa\rangle$ is an FU-iteration, $R_{\xi+1} = R_\xi * Q(\dot{A}_\xi, \dot{\alpha}_\xi)$. Write $Q^* = \left[\omega_2\right]^{<\omega} \times \left[\omega_2\right]^{<\omega}$. Clearly $1_{P_f * R_\xi} \Vdash$ "$Q(\dot{A}_\xi, \dot{\alpha}_\xi) \subset Q^*$".

We consider the elements of $P_f * \dot{R}_\kappa$ as pairs $\langle p, \dot{r}\rangle$, where $p \in P_f$ and $p \Vdash$ "$\dot{r}$ *is a finite function,* $\mathrm{dom}(\dot{r}) \subset \kappa$ *and* $\dot{r}\lceil\xi \Vdash_{\dot{R}_\xi} \dot{r}(\xi) \in Q(\dot{A}_\xi, \dot{\alpha}_\xi)$ *for each* $\xi \in \mathrm{dom}(\dot{r})$".

Definition 3.8. A condition $\langle p, r\rangle \in P_f * R_\kappa$ is called *determined* if $r \in \mathrm{Fn}(\kappa, Q^*, \omega)$, (i.e r is a finite function, not only a P_f-name of a finite function) moreover for each $\xi \in \mathrm{dom}(r)$ we have $\mathrm{supp}(r(\xi)) \subset a^p$ and there is an ordinal $\alpha \in a^p$ such that $\langle p, r\lceil\xi\rangle \Vdash$ "$\dot\alpha_\xi = \hat\alpha$".

Clearly the family $\mathcal{D}$ of the determined conditions is dense in $P_f * R_\kappa$. We claim that $\mathcal{D}$ witnesses that R_κ is nice. Indeed let $\langle p_0, r_0\rangle, \langle p_1, r_1\rangle \in \mathcal{D}$, $p, p' \in P_f$ be such that $p \le p_0, p_1$, $p' \le p_0, p_1$,

$$(+) \qquad p \Vdash \text{"}r_0 \text{ and } r_1 \text{ are compatible in } \dot R\text{"}$$

and either $p \le p'$ or $p \prec p'$.

Write $r_i(\xi) = \langle s_i(\xi), C_i(\xi)\rangle$ for $\xi \in \mathrm{dom}(r_i)$. Let $D = \mathrm{dom}(r_0) \cup \mathrm{dom}(r_1)$. For $i < 2$ and $\xi \in D$ let

$$s_i^*(\xi) = \begin{cases} s_i(\xi) & \text{if } \xi \in \mathrm{dom}(r_i), \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$C_i^*(\xi) = \begin{cases} C_i(\xi) & \text{if } \xi \in \mathrm{dom}(r_i), \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Consider the condition $r^* \in \mathrm{Fn}(\kappa, Q^*, \omega)$ defined by the stipulations $\mathrm{dom}(r^*) = D$ and $r^*(\xi) = \langle s_0^*(\xi) \cup s_1^*(\xi), C_0^*(\xi) \cup C_1^*(\xi)\rangle$ for $\xi \in D$. We show that $p' \Vdash$ "r^* *is a common extension of* r_0 *and* r_1 *in* R_κ." We prove a bit more: we show, by a finite induction, that for each $\xi \in D$

$$p' \Vdash \text{"}r^*\lceil\xi + 1 \in R_{\xi+1} \text{ and } r^*\lceil\xi + 1 \le r_0\lceil\xi + 1, r_1\lceil\xi + 1\text{."}$$

The non-trivial step is when $\xi \in \mathrm{dom}(r_0) \cap \mathrm{dom}(r_1)$.

Since $\langle p', r^*\lceil\xi\rangle \le \langle p', r_i\lceil\xi\rangle$ by the induction hypothesis, it follows that $\langle p', r^*\lceil\xi\rangle \Vdash$ "$s_i(\xi) \in \left[\dot A_\xi\right]^{<\omega}$" and so $\langle p', r^*\lceil\xi\rangle \Vdash$ "$r^*(\xi) \in Q(\dot A_\xi, \dot\alpha_\xi)$", that is, $p' \Vdash$ "$r^*\lceil\xi + 1 \in R_{\xi+1}$".

By $(+)$ for some P_f-name $\dot r$ and $P_f * R_\xi$-name $\dot q$ we have $\langle p, \dot r\rangle \in P_f * R_\xi$ and $\langle p, \dot r\rangle \Vdash$ "$\dot q \in Q(\dot A_\xi, \dot\alpha_\xi)$ *is a common extension of* $r_0(\xi)$ *and* $r_1(\xi)$". Hence $\langle p, \dot r\rangle \Vdash$ "$s^{\dot q} \setminus s_0(\xi) \subset \mathrm{U}(\alpha, C_0(\xi))$ and $s^{\dot q} \supset s_1(\xi)$". Therefore $\langle p, \dot r\rangle \Vdash$ "$s_1(\xi) \setminus s_0(\xi) \subset \mathrm{U}(\alpha, C_0(\xi))$". By $\mathrm{supp}(r_i(\xi)) \subset a^p$, this can only happen if

$$(\dagger) \qquad s_1(\xi) \setminus s_0(\xi) \subset u^p(\alpha, C_0(\xi)).$$

But both $p \le p'$ and $p \prec p'$ together with $(\dagger)$ imply

$$(\ddagger) \qquad s_1(\xi) \setminus s_0(\xi) \subset u^{p'}(\alpha, C_0(\xi)).$$

Thus $p' \Vdash$ "$s_1(\xi) \setminus s_0(\xi) \subset \mathrm{U}(\alpha, C_0(\xi))$", i.e. $\langle p', r^*\lceil\xi\rangle$ "$\Vdash r^*(\xi) \le r_0(\xi)$". Similarly, it can be proved that $\langle p', r^*\lceil\xi\rangle \Vdash$ "$r^*(\xi) \le r_1(\xi)$". Thus we have carried out the induction step and the theorem is proved. □

Now we are ready to prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.9. *Assume that CH holds in the ground model V, there is a Δ-function f and λ is a cardinal such that $\omega_1 < \lambda = \lambda^\omega$. Then in V^{P_f} there is an FU-iteration $\dot{R}_\lambda$ of length λ such that in $V^{P_f * \dot{R}_\lambda}$ the space X_f is Frechet-Uryson and satisfies 2.4(i)–(iii), moreover $V^{P_f * \dot{R}_\lambda} \models$ "$2^\kappa = (\lambda^\kappa)^V$ for each cardinal $\kappa \geq \omega$".*

Proof. Since $|P_f| = \omega_2$ and P_f satisfies c.c.c we have $(\lambda^\omega)^{V^{P_f}} \leq ((|P_f|\lambda)^\omega)^V = (\lambda^\omega)^V = \lambda$. Therefore, using a suitable book-keeping procedure in V^{P_f} (see [6, Ch VIII. 6.3] for this technique) we can construct an FU-iteration $\langle R_\xi : \xi \leq \lambda \rangle$, $R_{\xi+1} = R_\xi * Q(\dot{A}_\xi, \dot{\alpha}_\xi)$, having the following property: for every pair $\langle A, \alpha \rangle$ if A is a countable subset of X_f in $V^{P_f * R_\lambda}$ and $\alpha \in \overline{A}$ then for some $\xi < \lambda$ we have $V^{P_f * R_\xi} \models$ "$Q(A_\xi, \alpha_\xi) = Q(A, \alpha)$". Thus

(*) $V^{P_f * R_\lambda} \models$ "*if $\alpha \in \omega_2$ is in the closure of a countable set $A \subset X_f$ then there is a sequence $\{s_n : n \in \omega\} \subset A$ which converges to α*".

Since R_λ has property K in V^{P_f}, by theorem 3.1 the space X_f remains countably tight in $V^{P_f * R_\lambda}$. Putting together this observation with (*) it follows that $V^{P_f * R_\lambda} \models$ "X_f is Frechet-Uryson".

An FU-iteration is nice by theorem 3.7, and so X_f has property 2.4(iii) in $V^{P_f * R_\lambda}$ by theorem 3.4. Since X_f is right separated it remains locally compact in any extension of V^{P_f}. Since R_λ satisfies c.c.c the space X_f has property 2.4(ii) in $V^{P_f * R_\lambda}$ by theorem 3.2. All this implies that X_f remains initially ω_1-compact and normal.

Finally we investigate the cardinal exponents in $V^{P_f * \dot{R}_\lambda}$. Since $|P_f| = \omega_2$ and $1_{P_f} \Vdash$"$|R_\lambda| = \lambda$", the iteration $P_f * R_\lambda$ contains a dense subset $\mathcal{D}$ of cardinality $\leq \lambda$. Since $P_f * R_\lambda$ satisfies c.c.c it follows that for each $\kappa \geq \omega$ we have $(2^\kappa)^{V^{P_f * R_\lambda}} \leq ((|\mathcal{D}|^\omega)^\kappa)^V = (\lambda^\kappa)^V$.

On the other hand every successor step of an FU-iteration introduces a new subset of a countable set, and so $(2^\omega)^{V^{P_f * R_\lambda}} \geq \lambda$. Consequently, $V^{P_f * R_\lambda} \models$"$2^\kappa = (2^{\omega)^\kappa} \geq \lambda^\kappa \geq (\lambda^\kappa)^V$", which proves what we wanted. □

Theorem 3.9 answers a question raised by Arhangel'skiĭ, [1, problem 3], in the negative: CH can not be weakened to $2^\omega < 2^{\omega_1}$ in the theorem of van Douwen and Dow. In fact we proved much more: the existence of a Frechet-Uryson, initially ω_1-compact and non-compact space is consistent with practically any cardinal arithmetic that violates CH. More precisely, if we have a ZFC model V in which CH holds and $\lambda = \lambda^\omega \leq 2^{\omega_1}$, then we can find a cardinal preserving generic extension W of V which contains a Frechet-Uryson and normal counterexample to the van Douwen–Dow question, $(2^\omega)^W = \lambda$, moreover $(2^\kappa)^W = (2^\kappa)^V$ for each $\kappa \geq \omega_1$. We can obtain W as follows. First we force the σ-complete poset P of Shelah (see [3]) which introduces a Δ-function f in V^P. Since P is σ-complete and $|P| = \omega_2$, forcing with P does not change 2^κ for any $\kappa \geq \omega$. Now forcing with P_f over V^P introduces

the counterexample X_f to the van Douwen–Dow question. Since $|P_f| = \omega_2$, the cardinal exponents are the same in V^P and in V^{P_f} for uncountable cardinals and $(2^\omega)^{V^{P*P_f}} = \omega_2$. Finally we can apply theorem 3.9 to get the desired final model $W = V^{P*P_f*R_\lambda}$. Let us remark that we have $(2^\kappa)^W = (2^\kappa)^V$ for $\kappa \geq \omega_1$ because $(2^\kappa)^V = (\lambda^\kappa)^V$ by $\lambda \leq 2^{\omega_1}$.

Let us remark that for any cardinal κ the poset $\mathrm{Fn}(\kappa, 2, \omega)$, i.e. the forcing notion that adds κ many Cohen reals, is clearly nice over P_f, as is witnessed by the dense set of the determined conditions. Thus, by theorems 3.1, 3.2 and 3.4 , adding Cohen reals will preserve properties 2.4(i)–(iii) of X_f, especially X_f remains countably tight and initially ω_1-compact. It is worthwhile to mention that, in contrast with this, Alan Dow proved in [4] that if CH holds in the ground model V then adding Cohen reals can not introduce a countably tight, initially ω_1-compact and non-compact T_3 space.

Let us finish by formulating the following higher cardinal version of the van Douwen–Dow problem:

Problem 2. *Is it provable in ZFC that an initially ω_2-compact T_3 space of countable tightness is compact ?*

The main problem is trying to use out approach that worked for ω_2 (instead of ω_3) here is that no Δ-function may exist for ω_3! This problem has come up already in the efforts trying to lift the result of [3] from ω_2 to ω_3.

REFERENCES

1. A. V. Arhangel'skiĭ, *On countably compact and initially ω_1-compact topological spaces and groups*, Math. Japonica, **40**, No 1(1994), 39–53.
2. Z. Balog, A. Dow, D. Fremlin, P. Nyikos, *Countable tightness and proper forcing*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **19** (1988) 295–298.
3. J. E. Baumgartner, S. Shelah, *Remarks on superatomic Boolean algebras*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic, **33** (l987), no. 2, 119-129.
4. A. Dow , *On initially κ-compact spaces*, in: Rings of continuous functions, ed. C.E. Aull, Lecture Notes in pure and applied Mathematics, 1985., v.95, Marcel Dekker, Inc, New York and Basel, pp. 103–108.
5. I. Juhász, W. Weiss, *Omitting the cardinality of the continuum in scattered spaces*, Topology and its Applications, **31** (1989) 19–27.
6. K. Kunen, *Set Theory*, North Holland, Amsterdam - New York, 1980.
7. M Rabus, *A ω_2-minimal Boolean algebra*, Logic E-print.
8. J. Roitman, *Height and width of superatomic Boolean Algebras*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **94** (1985), no 1, 9–14.
9. J. R. Shoenfield, *Martin's Axiom*, Am. Math. Monthly, **82**(6) (1975), 610–617.

Mathematical Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences
E-mail address: juhasz@math-inst.hu

Mathematical Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences
E-mail address: soukup@math-inst.hu